



or two points,—they adopted a resolution, declaring that they would not give their suffrages to any candidates for the chief executive and legislative offices in the nation, unless they were in favor of immediate abolition. The other question discussed was, the propriety of a separate political organization. It was debated at some length in the Convention, and then disposed of by referring it to the discretion of the local societies. Whether so designed or not, the resolution with regard to the proper standard of abolition-demand, prepared the way for the abandonment of the common mode of political action, and for the formation of an abolition political party.

The Convention adjourned. In a few months the Rochester Freeman raised the standard of such a party. The arguments of Mr. Holley were republished in the Emancipator, and endorsed by its editor. The editor of the Massachusetts Abolitionist, Eliza Wright, concurred. Then followed Alvan Stewart, and next, Mr. Gerrit Smith, the last, with fear and trembling. John G. Whittier gave his sanction to the movement, and Mr. Birney, it is well known, has been a decided supporter of it since the Cleveland Convention. Meantime the measure has been discussed in our papers; advocated in the Emancipator, Friend of Man, and Massachusetts Abolitionist; opposed in the Liberator, Philanthropist, Herald of Freedom, Voice of Freedom, Michigan Freeman, Charter Oak, Union Herald, &c. The Pennsylvania Freeman under its new editor, is adverse to it; the Christian Witness remains neutral, and the Maine Advocate of Freedom is undecided. It has found very little favor with the great body of Abolitionists. The societies in Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Vermont, New Hampshire, Western Pennsylvania, and the friends generally in Illinois and Indiana have condemned it.

Notwithstanding this diversity of opinion, the advocates of the measure resolved on calling a convention of Abolitionists on the first of April, to discuss the propriety of separate nominations for the presidency. The convention consisted of 121 persons, 104 of whom were from New York State. Five other states were specially represented. By a vote of 44 to 33 the Convention resolved to make a separate nomination, and Jas. G. Birney and Thomas Earle were selected as the candidates.

The effects of this new movement on the anti-slavery cause in many respects have appeared unfavorable. In the East great division of sentiment prevails with regard to it; and the discussions to which it has given birth are conducted in a spirit not the most favorable to cordial co-operation or a unanimous decision. The excessive zeal of some, it is to be feared, has cooled the ardor of others who have hitherto been devoted friends of our cause. In our own state, these effects are also beginning to be seen.

Referring from any attempt at argument on the subject, which would bring up the question, prematurely before the convention, the Committee would remark, that, while the new course of political action proposed for adoption, is, in fact, the old course has in many places been productive of the happiest effects. In Massachusetts the results have been decisive, so far as the legislature is concerned. This year, notwithstanding the intestine broils among the Abolitionists, that commonwealth, the legislature has gone further than at any former period, since the era of abolition, in behalf of human rights. It not only has passed resolutions, solemnly protesting against the gag-rule of Congress, and demanding its immediate repeal; affirming the right of any person of the people to petition Congress for redress of grievances or to what to them may seem such, and the duty of Congress to receive them, and respectfully consider them; denouncing the mode of treating abolition petitions by the Senate, as a virtual denial of the right of petition, and no less despotic, in effect, than the unconstitutional rule adopted by the House; and finally, declaring, that whatever institution or system cannot bear the light of investigation, is manifestly corrupt and dangerous, and ought not to be allowed to exist on a free soil. It not only has passed these stern resolutions, but a vote of 396 to 11. It not only has adopted resolutions in regard to the rights of colored citizens of Massachusetts in slave-states. But, it has gone further, and fully responded to the prayers of abolitionists, in regard to slavery and the slave-trade in the District of Columbia, &c.; as will be seen by the following resolutions, which are too good to be abridged.

**COMMON WEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.** In the Year One Thousand Eight Hundred and Forty, RESOLVES Relating to Slavery and the Slave Trade, and the admission of new States into the Union.

Whereas, domestic slavery exists in the District of Columbia; under the express authority of Congress, which, as the time of the year, the said District, has enacted the slave codes of Maryland and Virginia; and whereas, the sanction thus given to slavery, and its continued toleration at the seat of government, is a manifest violation by the nation of the first principles of justice, and have a tendency to corrupt the moral sense, and to lower the character of the whole people of the United States; and whereas, this nation can have no higher interests, either before God or in the eyes of men, than the establishing of justice, and the securing of the just claims of national honor; and whereas, slavery in the District of Columbia, being thus a national concern, and involving national responsibility, it is the duty of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, to remonstrate against the common crime and the degradation of national character, to interfere.

Resolved, That Congress ought to exercise its acknowledged power, in the immediate suppression of slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia. And whereas, by the Constitution of the United States, Congress has the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and between the several states, and to regulate the exercise of such power, Congress in the year 1800, abolished the foreign slave trade; and whereas, a domestic slave trade, as organized and carried on in the African slave trade, and scarcely less cruel and inhuman in practice, is now carried on between the several states, therefore,

Resolved, That the domestic slave trade ought to be abolished by Congress, without delay.

Resolved, That no slave should be admitted into the Union, whose constitution shall tolerate domestic slavery.

Resolved, That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives requested, to use their most efforts to give effect to the foregoing resolutions.

Resolved, That H. C. Reelers, the Governor, be requested, to give effect to the foregoing resolutions.

passed to forward a copy of these resolutions to each of the Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts in Congress, and to the governors of the several states, to be by them laid before their respective legislatures.

But one thing more remains to be done—and that is, the repeal of the law relating to intermarriages, the last vestige of the slave-code. The measure was attempted this year, and failed only by a very small vote. Another year it will be carried.

All this has been accomplished in a state where the power of Abolitionists is lessened by internal dissensions, under a system of political action, which has been pronounced a total failure!

The anti-slavery action of the New York Assembly is also much in advance of any thing that has been done by it in former years. That Assembly, self-moved, by a vote of 85 to 10 in the House, and 20 to 4 in the Senate, adopted resolutions protesting against the gag-rule of Congress as an open and direct infringement of the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States; and censuring the conduct of that part of the New York delegation in Congress, that voted for it. Subsequently, the Assembly chamber was granted to the New York Anti-Slavery Society, for the purpose of hearing an abolition lecture from Mr. Alvan Stewart. Next, it rejected a resolution disapproving of the movements of Abolitionists. And finally, it has passed a most admirable bill, securing to persons claimed as fugitive slaves, the full benefits of a jury-trial.

All these acts are the fruits of abolition sentiment, brought to bear upon the legislature, by means of that very mode of political action, whose total failure is alleged as a sufficient reason, for the formation of a separate abolition party.

There are three reasons why this mode of political action has been followed by no equally decisive results in Ohio. 1st, Abolitionists in this state are fewer relatively than in Massachusetts, and fewer absolutely than in New York. 2nd, They have not equalled their brethren in those two states in systematic and faithful efforts to bring their principles to bear on the polls. 3d, For two years past, the majority in the General Assembly of this state has belonged to that party, whose uniform policy it is to conciliate the South, by extreme measures against Abolitionism. Let it not be misunderstood. We sincerely sympathize with the policy of the opposition party, should it gain the ascendancy, would not be the same in this respect, we do not say. Our only object now, is to point out the reasons why the common mode of anti-slavery political action has hitherto effected so little in this state.

It is generally agreed, that it is our right and duty to exercise the right of suffrage in such a way as to stamp our principles on the legislation of the country. The great question is, which is the most effectual way of reaching this object. This question cannot safely be settled hastily. The large majority of abolitionists still adheres to the customary mode of political action. A minority, distinguished for zeal, and honesty, and talent, repudiates this mode, and would establish an abolition political party. The question between them, it is generally admitted, is a question of expediency. Such being the case, it is evident, that the discussion should be conducted in a fraternal spirit, under a deep sense of the importance of maintaining union, without stubbornness on one part, or dogmatism on the other; and that no new, general measure should be rashly attempted, so long as there is hope of uniting the whole body of abolitionists in some conclusive course of action. One thing is certain, however we may distract ourselves and weaken our influence by dissensions, the slaveholders know too well the value of union, not to unite as one man in supporting slavery. Minor divisions of opinion they may entertain, but when slavery is in danger, they array in its defence an unbroken phalanx. Their continued enmities should admonish the friends of liberty, that this is no time to fall out by the way.

Slavery is an abuse, and, inasmuch as an abuse, by its very nature is doomed to destruction, it naturally strives to avoid its fate by bringing the entire power of the government to protect it. It meddles with every question, seeks to control every interest, declares war against every system or principle based on truth, trembles at any action independent of its influence, and boldly announces itself as the cornerstone of our political institutions. 'Whenever,' says a profound French philosopher, 'there is an abuse in the social order, it appears to be the foundation of it, because, being heterogeneous and solitary in its nature, it is necessary for its preservation, that everything should yield to it, that it should be the centre of every thing, and hence why it is, that every department of our national government is under the control of slavery—that the constitution and laws of the country, the Chief Executive, Congress and the Judiciary, state sovereignty and individual rights, the politics, the literature and the religion of the nation, have all been compelled to yield more or less to the power of slavery. The only safety of this enormous abuse is to be found in, universal supremacy. Hence, the process of prosa-very purification to which our school, and general literature has been subjected; the abject subservience of political parties, especially at the present time, our party, by brawling abuse of abolitionists, and other sneaking apologies, if caught in the act of maintaining a liberal principle or measure, endeavoring to conciliate the favor of the slaveholder; hence the corruption of the church, & the moral reluctance of its ministry to rebuke the sin of oppression; the absorption of the right of petition by the present Congress, is disrespectful to sovereign states in refusing to receive the resolves of their legislatures, and many other circumstances, which it is needless to name.

The spirit of domination, growing out of this enormous abuse is specially manifest in the construction put upon the present gag law of Congress. The rule of the House of Representatives, which declares, that no petition, memorial, resolution or other paper, praying for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, or any state or territory, or the slave-trade between the states or territories of the United States, in which it now exists, shall be received by the House, or entertained in any way, has been constructed by the slaveholding Speaker, so as to exclude 1st. Petitions for the abolition of the slave-trade within the District of Columbia; 2nd. Petitions against the foreign slave-trade; 3d. Petitions in regard to the protection of free people of color in the District, against the legal presumption of their being slaves; 4th. Memorials against the admission of Florida into the Union, as a slave-state. And that there may be no record of the infamous despotism of this Congress, the Speaker has decided, 1st. That under the same rule, there should be no entry on the journal of the fact that such petitions were presented; and 2nd. That it is not in order for members who present them to move for such an entry. Never was there a completer, more rigid, and more detestable system of tyranny than that, under which the people of the United States have been deprived of the right of petition. While slavery thus forbids Congress to entertain a petition against it, it hesitates not to demand additional favors at the hand of the general government. On the 10th of February three resolutions were introduced into the House by slaveholders, each one contemplating specific action in behalf of slavery. One was in relation to the Enterprise, and slaves on board of her liberated by the authorities of Bermuda, in consequence of her having been driven into that port by stress of weather. Another related to slaves captured by the Creek Indians, and the expediency of compensating the owners out of appropriations made by Congress. The last contemplated the opening of negotiations with Great Britain for the reclamation of fugitive slaves. Not the slightest objection was made to entertaining these resolutions, but they were received and respectfully treated, as being proper subjects of congressional action. Had the resolution of the legislature of the sovereign state of Massachusetts, protesting against the admission of any new slave state into the Union been presented, she would have been insulted at once by a direct refusal on the part of the House to receive it, or in any way entertain it!

March 11th, Mr. Lumpkins presented in the Senate, resolutions of the Georgia legislature, asking Congress so to amend the laws relating to fugitive slaves, as to authorize the demand for such fugitives to be made upon a Federal Judge in the state where they may have taken refuge, and making it the duty of such Judge, on the demand being properly made, to deliver them up. The amendment asked for, if granted, would have deprived the free states of one of the most essential attributes of sovereignty—that of protecting their own citizens. Arrogant and menacing speeches were made by the slaveholders; and, on their demand that the resolutions should be printed, and referred to the Judiciary committee, the motion was sustained without opposition.

On the 4th of March Mr. Calhoun introduced into the Senate resolutions impugning the justice of British laws, which make free every slave the moment his foot touches British soil, no matter how he may have reached there. They also affirmed the right of our government to reclaim slaves who may be shipwrecked on British shores, or driven by stress of weather into British ports. The tendency of the resolutions evidently was to bring this nation into collision with Great Britain on the subject of slavery. Mr. Calhoun was permitted, subsequently, to advocate his resolutions at length.—They were respectfully considered, and unanimously passed, all the whig senators from the northern states, except Mr. Dixon, of Rhode Island, absented themselves. The right of the American slave-trader to carry on the domestic slave-trade, was hereby substantially affirmed, by the Senate; and their readiness to plunge into a war with Great Britain, at least so far as such resolutions go, was clearly manifested.

Now, how does the sovereign state fare in a more important matter than the loss of a few slaves on a foreign soil, in a matter more vital, than the mode in which the delivery of an occasional runaway slave is to be regulated? One of the resolutions of the legislature of Massachusetts had regard to the protection of colored citizens of that state against certain laws of other states, which imprison them, and reduce them to slavery, if they happen to be within their limits. A breach of the Constitution, a flagrant violation of the rights of the citizen, are these laws. Certainly she is as much entitled to be heard, in speaking through her legislature, in behalf of her citizens, as Mr. Calhoun, in vindicating the rights of a few slave-traders, or Georgia, in demanding federal legislation in favor of slavery. What are the facts?

Monday, April 13th, 1840.

Mr. Adams having presented certain resolutions of the Legislature of Massachusetts in relation to laws passed by other states, which tend to the imprisonment of citizens of Massachusetts within their bounds, moved their reference to a select committee.

Mr. Andrews, of Kentucky, moved that they be referred to a select committee.

on a motion, Mr. Calhoun, of Massachusetts, demanded the yeas and nays; which being read, resulted as follows: yeas 109, nays 48.

The same disposition was made of another resolution of the Massachusetts Legislature, declaring the rule adopted by the House of Representatives excluding abolition petitions, to be in violation of the Constitution—yeas 109, nays 48.

It is needless to comment on these facts; or to record a multitude of similar outrages. Enough has been advanced to show, that this nation is reduced to a condition of the most degrading vassalage to the slaveholder; that there is but one way peacefully to deliver it, and that is, by well-directed political action—by electing men to office, who will know how, and dare, not only to resist slavery, but to bring the whole force of a reformed public sentiment to bear upon it in all constitutional ways, so as finally to destroy it forever. And surely the evil with which we contend is not so feeble, as to embolden us to waste our energies in conflict with each other, or weaken them by divisions.

Abolitionists have arrived at a dangerous crisis. The administration party, in the West particularly, has racked its ingenuity to discover new modes of manifesting its subservience to the South, and hatred of abolition. The last legislature of Ohio outstripped its predecessors in this disgraceful policy. Every thing which envenomed malice could suggest, and a limited compass compels us to leave unmentioned, which they had no longer any thing to hope from the democratic party. The danger now is, that under the influence of hasty resentment, or a vague expectation of benefit from a political revolution, they may be tempted to compromise their principles in the approaching contest between the parties.

Their duty is clear. It is, to stand independent of parties; to allow themselves to be deluged by vague promises from neither; to maintain their principles at all hazards; to give their support to no candidate for office unless they have conclusive evidence, that he is in favor of reforming the state in regard to slavery. What is the use of a change of power if there be none of principle? A pro-slavery whig is as bad as a pro-slavery democrat. To put down one nobly-minded man by elevating another, is benefiting nobody.

Servility is servility, anti-abolition is anti-abolition, by whomsoever practiced. It is not our vocation to avenge our own wrongs; to strive against a party that has abused us, but by force of realisation. Then indeed we might form any alliance however incongruous. The work of abolitionists is, to establish the principles of civil liberty, and procure the repeal of all laws which in any way violate the rights of the colored man, or contribute to perpetuate the wrongs of the slave. No matter how much indignity may be offered to them by one party, so long as the other refuses to give them sufficient ground for believing that it will not do likewise. To support the whig party for the sake of retaliating our injuries on the democratic party, would be irrational and mean; and at the same time, bring our cause into contempt, and our own reputation into disrepute. We must steadily and inflexibly demand submission from both parties to our principles. Nothing can be more reasonable.

What are our principles? Are they any thing more or less than what we find recorded in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the Constitution of Ohio?

Whatever changes take place, abolitionism must not suffer; no important interests are involved in it. No true anti-slavery man, whether whig or democrat, will ever consent to regard the question of slavery as a minor consideration.

As it is desirable to publish at once all that is to be published, respecting our proceedings at Massillon, we have thought it best to give in this number the following speech. The order of the Convention to publish it, must be our apology for filling up our columns with so long an article.

**REMARKS**  
On the question of Political Action.

[Made before the Ohio State Anti-Slavery Convention at Massillon, by G. BAILEY.]

Mr. President:

The critical point in our enterprise, has at length been reached. So long as the duties of abolitionists were confined to writing, speaking, giving; to the use of those means which are included under the general phrase—moral-suasion—all was harmony of opinion, and concert of movement. But, when it became a duty to act, to act politically, as well as to testify, the germs of division began to show themselves. No immediate danger, threatened, so long as our societies and conventions contented themselves with stating some general principles of action, and merely recommending to abolitionists, adherence to them in practice. But, when the matter was taken in hand seriously—when political action began to be insisted upon as a religious duty—when it became manifest, that our conventions were determined to adopt a policy, which would bind every abolitionist to a duty, which would bind every party—prejudice or interest, should the welfare of our enterprise demand it; then came strife, contention, lukewarmness on the part of some, zeal on the part of others. Then came open division of sentiment, and a loss of mutual confidence, that augured badly for the cause. Need we say that we are describing an existing state of things?

Now I take it for granted, that there is no abolitionist present, who does not hold, that it is his duty to maintain his principles felt at the ballot-box. We all are convinced of the propriety, the necessity of political action. But, as to the principles which should regulate this action—here is the dividing point. I believe the duty is not so great as by many is supposed. Hitherto, at none of our anniversaries in this state, have we investigated at length, the subject of the political duties of abolitionists. General resolutions have been passed, without however examining the principles on which they were based, or the results to which they might lead. They have been passed, rather as a matter of course, than with a just appreciation of their nature, and a deliberate intention to abide by them in practice. Is it any wonder, then, that as the duty of political action presses on us more and more, we should find ourselves without plan, without harmony?

The time has arrived when we must meet the question. It is at length brought, for the first

time, fully and fairly under our notice. We are called upon to act with much foreboding, deliberation, caution. Let us bear in mind, that every principle must not of necessity be settled at once—every thing be done in this connection, nothing left for succeeding ones. It is the part of wisdom to decide on as many principles and measures as we can; and to postpone further decisions, where it becomes manifest that they will only end in wrangling and division. We must take it for granted that our brethren are honest; and, that if they cannot be convinced now, they may be next year.

The resolutions contemplate a vigorous course of political action, and are intended to be conciliatory. They embrace principles, it is hoped, on which we all can agree; although they may not embrace others, which a few think highly important. They certainly go as far as the state of anti-slavery sentiment in Ohio now renders proper; though not so far as we may find it expedient to go hereafter. The great object is, while we take strong ground now, and prepare the way for still stronger, to maintain union and mutual confidence.

In truth, we are in a critical condition. If no platform can be framed on this subject, on which we can all stand, and co-operate, evil must result. I stand here, an advocate of union—but a union only upon right principles. If union is to be secured by the sacrifice of the integrity of our cause, by compromising our principles with any reigning party, then welcome division. Twelve men with right principles and consistent action, will do more, than thousands who are united in daily violating their own professed principles. It is not the time to indulge in proscriptive, or push speculative dogmas to extremes, until we drive off from our association, men, whether, in all the great principles of political action, we are not agreed. I think we are—I am sure we are.—Call to mind the grandeur of our object. Shall the excitements of party warfare raging around us, blind us to the dishonor of our country, close our ears to the clanking of chains in our land, cause us to forget our high vocation? What is our mission? It is, to emancipate a sixth part of our countrymen, deliver our government from bondage to the slaveholding power—as relentless, as it is grasping—to establish the principles of the Declaration of Independence, wipe away from our nation the reproach of inhumanity, meanness, and hypocrisy, and thus present her to the world, a bright and beautiful example to the greatness that may be attained by a holy regard for human rights and obedience to God. If, in the fulfillment of this glorious mission, we should be called upon to make sacrifices, shall we not do it? If we are not prepared for self-sacrifice, who is? Millions of our fellow-citizens are engaged in taking care of the common interests of our country. The welfare of the slave is a matter alien to their sympathies. A profession of regard for this welfare is the tie that binds us together—the reason why we are here assembled. We are but few—but we are all, who are doing any thing for his interests. Are we not prepared to make a few sacrifices, for his great gain? While nearly three millions of human beings are crushed down under a load of intolerable wrong in our borders, shall we not, if necessary, rejoice in giving up party attachments and prejudices? If we cannot be greatly injured, should our several parties be defeated. But, what hope is there at our hands for the chained and degraded slave, unless we make his cause a paramount one?

I will now make a few explanatory remarks on the resolutions, that have been read, and leave them to the Convention to dispose of.

The first resolution declares, that in the opinion of this Convention, the anti-slavery cause has claims upon American citizens, in a political point of view, paramount to the claims of any of the questions which now divide political parties.

Are there any here who will deny the truth of this declaration? There may be some—some, who, while they admit that the question, whether three millions of slaves shall be emancipated, transcends in importance all present political questions, do yet suppose that we, in the free states, can do so little politically, as to decide, that we may have other political questions of more importance. Were the whole subject of slavery within the jurisdiction of Congress—had this body as much power to abolish the system in the states, as in the District of Columbia, there is no abolitionist on this floor, however indispensed hitherto to political action, who would not at once confess that the question of slavery with us, ought to be the paramount, political question. But there are those who think, that our political connections with slavery on the whole are so slight, that political action in regard to them, may, without sacrifice of principle, be subordinate.

Let us examine this matter. Let us see what are the circumstances from which arise our political responsibilities.

First—there are our laws against the free colored people, and indirectly supporting slavery—laws, which deprive them of the benefit of a jury-trial, in those cases where it is most needed; which license and invite the commission of violence and fraud, and the person and property, to degrade and dishonor them, and finally, by forbidding them to bear testimony against a white man, which condemn them to ignorance by excluding them from the benefits of the common-school fund; which humiliate, and insult and vex them by presuming them slaves, and making them pay for freedom-certificates; which punish our citizens with heavy fines or imprisonment, for obeying the dictates of humanity and commands of God, in extending mercy to the outcast and wanderer, which make it obligatory on all officers of the law to

recognize slavery in the slave states, without proof,—and there too, is the organic law, without right of suffrage, because of their color, which their property is taxed—thus violating the principle which constituted the chief ground of justification of our rebellion against Great Britain. Now here is a goodly catalogue of laws, for a state professing to be republican and cherishing the principles of our constitution—palpable and extraordinary contradictions to the doctrine of equality, which our national and state existence is based upon. Are they not wanton invasions of the great rights—those developments of the law, against the poor slave helpless—hold information of the law of God, which commands us to love our neighbor as ourselves; and do they not convict us at once of hypocrisy and sin? There laws are made by us—their means, and wickedness come by us, their responsibility rests the responsibility of their repeal, we may delude ourselves, if we please, with false reasoning,—still, it is we, who are the cause, that no prospect of party, pecuniary, or other interest, however great, will justify us in sojourning the question of redressing wrongs upon to decide between giving a plain act of justice, now, or putting it off, until it shall have become some advantage to myself, how shall we decide? Which ought I to postpone—a question which regards my own interests or the interests of my party, or a question which concerns the redress of certain wrongs I am inflicting on a brother man? Can any expected good to myself outweigh, justly me in delaying justice to him whom I have wronged? Eternally man's conscience answers, No. No avowed party-interest whatsoever, can excuse the abandonment of a question of right and wrong. The question then of the repeal of the laws of this state against colored people, is paramount, and ought not to be postponed.

The same reasoning holds good in the case of slaves held in the District of Columbia, and the domestic slave-trade. Some of you may have noticed in the papers a few months since, some astounding developments in regard to the extent of this traffic.—90,000 slaves imported last year! Mississippi in the space of three years—every hill-top covered, every village surrounded with the tents of the trafficker in human blood and bones! Have you ever estimated how many families must have been broken up, how many tender ties torn asunder, how many hearts broken, how many mothers left childless, how many wives, widows, how many waifs made to go on into the arms of the God of the oppressed, while this brutal traffic was in progress? Whom will God hold accountable for this murderous traffic—for the inconceivable anguish it has brought upon the poor and degraded? Those, who have the right and the power to put it down—the people of the free states, less than the abandoned slave-traders. For it is clearly within the power of our citizens, their votes to put an end to this wickedness. How is it possible that we can persuade ourselves that God will hold us guiltless, so long as we subordinate a question of such vital importance to questions of political economy?

Look further at our peculiar constitutional connections with slavery in the South. These, of such a character, as to involve us in political degradation, and extreme poverty. The law of God, and of nature, commands us to betray not the innocent, not to deliver up the slave to his master, not to join with the wicked man in his oppression. The Constitution of the United States requires us to give up to bondage, one whom we know is entitled to liberty by the same charter which secures it to us—to give our sanction to oppression.

Every sentiment of justice and humanity cries out against the damning injury, of aiding and abetting rebellion, rebellion—despite poverty, in its efforts to re-establish oppression over those who, appealing to the God of the oppressed, have given their chains, and solemnly pledged themselves to die, freemen, rather than be slaves. That detestable act, from which nature recoils in horror, the constitution requires us as a duty. The free states in fact, are compelled to stand sentinels over slavery, and hardly too strong language to say, that it exists now, mainly by force of the protection in the constitution, which secures for its position, the power of the whole nation.

But, sir, these connections politically defined, according to our numbers. Slaveholders, according to their slave-property, 25 represent on the floor of Congress represent slave property. Take one or two facts, as illustrations of the inequitable bearings of the ratio of representation fixed in the Constitution. New Jersey, with a free population of 218,568, has only six representatives in Congress, and four votes for President; and her portion of the free population was \$11,019,500; or 83 cents per free inhabitant of the state; while Georgia, with a free population of only 299,292, has 9 representatives and 11 electoral votes, and received the surplus revenue \$1,401,896, or \$4.84 per free inhabitant. Two free men of the N. South, are equal to three free men of the N. Ohio, with as many voters, within nine states, as Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi combined, has not one-third as many electors as representatives, as those political powers, or in them, less the hard-working free laborer, about three times as many as the free men of Ohio! Is not this degradation? Now, sir, this is a simple fact, when I consider it in its connection with the free trade in slaves, the cruel and the disastrous influence of the free trade on the independence of the free colored man, vexes me, fills me with indignation, that all the folly and misanthropy, that have been charged on the Administration, or any preceding ones.

Let us examine this matter. Let us see what are the circumstances from which arise our political responsibilities.

First—there are our laws against the free colored people, and indirectly supporting slavery—laws, which deprive them of the benefit of a jury-trial, in those cases where it is most needed; which license and invite the commission of violence and fraud, and the person and property, to degrade and dishonor them, and finally, by forbidding them to bear testimony against a white man, which condemn them to ignorance by excluding them from the benefits of the common-school fund; which humiliate, and insult and vex them by presuming them slaves, and making them pay for freedom-certificates; which punish our citizens with heavy fines or imprisonment, for obeying the dictates of humanity and commands of God, in extending mercy to the outcast and wanderer, which make it obligatory on all officers of the law to

recognize slavery in the slave states, without proof,—and there too, is the organic law, without right of suffrage, because of their color, which their property is taxed—thus violating the principle which constituted the chief ground of justification of our rebellion against Great Britain. Now here is a goodly catalogue of laws, for a state professing to be republican and cherishing the principles of our constitution—palpable and extraordinary contradictions to the doctrine of equality, which our national and state existence is based upon. Are they not wanton invasions of the great rights—those developments of the law, against the poor slave helpless—hold information of the law of God, which commands us to love our neighbor as ourselves; and do they not convict us at once of hypocrisy and sin? There laws are made by us—their means, and wickedness come by us, their responsibility rests the responsibility of their repeal, we may delude ourselves, if we please, with false reasoning,—still, it is we, who are the cause, that no prospect of party, pecuniary, or other interest, however great, will justify us in sojourning the question of redressing wrongs upon to decide between giving a plain act of justice, now, or putting it off, until it shall have become some advantage to myself, how shall we decide? Which ought I to postpone—a question which regards my own interests or the interests of my party, or a question which concerns the redress of certain wrongs I am inflicting on a brother man? Can any expected good to myself outweigh, justly me in delaying justice to him whom I have wronged? Eternally man's conscience answers, No. No avowed party-interest whatsoever, can excuse the abandonment of a question of right and wrong. The question then of the repeal of the laws of this state against colored people, is paramount, and ought not to be postponed.

The same reasoning holds good in the case of slaves held in the District of Columbia, and the domestic slave-trade. Some of you may have noticed in the papers a few months since, some astounding developments in regard to the extent of this traffic.—90,000 slaves imported last year! Mississippi in the space of three years—every hill-top covered, every village surrounded with the tents of the trafficker in human blood and bones! Have you ever estimated how many families must have been broken up, how many tender ties torn asunder, how many hearts broken, how many mothers left childless, how many wives, widows, how many waifs made to go on into the arms of the God of the oppressed, while this brutal traffic was in progress? Whom will God hold accountable for this murderous traffic—for the inconceivable anguish it has brought upon the poor and degraded? Those, who have the right and the power to put it down—the people of the free states, less than the abandoned slave-traders. For it is clearly within the power of our citizens, their votes to put an end to this wickedness. How is it possible that we can persuade ourselves that God will hold us guiltless, so long as we subordinate a question of such vital importance to questions of political economy?

Look further at our peculiar constitutional connections with slavery in the South. These, of such a character, as to involve us in political degradation, and extreme poverty. The law of God, and of nature, commands us to betray not the innocent, not to deliver up the slave to his master, not to join with the wicked man in his oppression. The Constitution of the United States requires us to give up to bondage, one whom we know is entitled to liberty by the same charter which secures it to us—to give our sanction to oppression.

Every sentiment of justice and humanity cries out against the damning injury, of aiding and abetting rebellion, rebellion—despite poverty, in its efforts to re-establish oppression over those who, appealing to the God of the oppressed, have given their chains, and solemnly pledged themselves to die, freemen, rather than be slaves. That detestable act, from which nature recoils in horror, the constitution requires us as a duty. The free states in fact, are compelled to stand sentinels over slavery, and hardly too strong language to say, that it exists now, mainly by force of the protection in the constitution, which secures for its position, the power of the whole nation.

But, sir, these connections politically defined, according to our numbers. Slaveholders, according to their slave-property, 25 represent on the floor of Congress represent slave property. Take one or two facts, as illustrations of the inequitable bearings of the ratio of representation fixed in the Constitution. New Jersey, with a free population of 218,568, has only six representatives in Congress, and four votes for President; and her portion of the free population was \$11,019,500; or 83 cents per free inhabitant of the state; while Georgia, with a free population of only 299,292, has 9 representatives and 11 electoral votes, and received the surplus revenue \$1,401,896, or \$4.84 per free inhabitant. Two free men of the N. South, are equal to three free men of the N. Ohio, with as many voters, within nine states, as Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi combined, has not one-third as many electors as representatives, as those political powers, or in them, less the hard-working free laborer, about three times as many as the free men of Ohio! Is not this degradation? Now, sir, this is a simple fact, when I consider it in its connection with the free trade in slaves, the cruel and the disastrous influence of the free trade on the independence of the free colored man, vexes me, fills me with indignation, that all the folly and misanthropy, that have been charged on the Administration, or any preceding ones.

Let us examine this matter. Let us see what are the circumstances from which arise our political responsibilities.

First—there are our laws against the free colored people, and indirectly supporting slavery—laws, which deprive them of the benefit of a jury-trial, in those cases where it is most needed; which license and invite the commission of violence and fraud, and the person and property, to degrade and dishonor them, and finally, by forbidding them to bear testimony against a white man, which condemn them to ignorance by excluding them from the benefits of the common-school fund; which humiliate, and insult and vex them by presuming them slaves, and making them pay for freedom-certificates; which punish our citizens with heavy fines or imprisonment, for obeying the dictates of humanity and commands of God, in extending mercy to the outcast and wanderer, which make it obligatory on all officers of the law to

recognize slavery in the slave states, without proof,—and there too, is the organic law, without right of suffrage, because of their color, which their property is taxed—thus violating the principle which constituted the chief ground of justification of our rebellion against Great Britain. Now here is a goodly catalogue of laws, for a state professing to be republican and cherishing the principles of our constitution—palpable and extraordinary contradictions to the doctrine of equality, which our national and state existence is based upon. Are they not wanton invasions of the great rights—those developments of the law, against the poor slave helpless—hold information of the law of God, which commands us to love our neighbor as ourselves; and do they not convict us at once of hypocrisy and sin? There laws are made by us—their means, and wickedness come by us, their responsibility rests the responsibility of their repeal, we may delude ourselves, if we please, with false reasoning,—still, it is we, who are the cause, that no prospect of party, pecuniary, or other interest, however great, will justify us in sojourning the question of redressing wrongs upon to decide between giving a plain act of justice, now, or putting it off, until it shall have become some advantage to myself, how shall we decide? Which ought I to postpone—a question which regards my own interests or the interests of my party, or a question which concerns the redress of certain wrongs I am inflicting on a brother man? Can any expected good to myself outweigh, justly me in delaying justice to him whom I have wronged? Eternally man's conscience answers, No. No avowed party-interest whatsoever, can excuse the abandonment of a question of right and wrong. The question then of the repeal of the laws of this state against colored people, is paramount, and ought not to be postponed.

The same reasoning holds good in the case of slaves held in the District of Columbia, and the domestic slave-trade. Some of you may have noticed in the papers a few months since, some astounding developments in regard to the extent of this traffic.—90,000 slaves imported last year! Mississippi in the space of three years—every hill-top covered, every village surrounded with the tents of the trafficker in human blood and bones! Have you ever estimated how many families must have been broken up, how many tender ties torn asunder, how many hearts broken, how many mothers left childless, how many wives, widows, how many waifs made to go on into the arms of the God of the oppressed, while this brutal traffic was in progress? Whom will God hold accountable for this murderous traffic—for the inconceivable anguish it has brought upon the poor and degraded? Those, who have the right and the power to put it down—the people of the free states, less than the abandoned slave-traders. For it is clearly within the power of our citizens, their votes to put an end to this wickedness. How is it possible that we can persuade ourselves that God will hold us guiltless, so long as we subordinate a question of such vital importance to questions of political economy?

Look further at our peculiar constitutional connections with slavery in the South. These, of such a character, as to involve us in political degradation, and extreme poverty. The law of God, and of nature, commands us to betray not the innocent, not to deliver up the slave to his master, not to join with the wicked man in his oppression. The Constitution of the United States requires us to give up to bondage, one whom we know is entitled to liberty by the same charter which secures it to us—to give our sanction to oppression.

Every sentiment of justice and humanity cries out against the damning injury, of aiding and abetting rebellion, rebellion—despite poverty, in its efforts to re-establish oppression over those who, appealing to the God of the oppressed, have given their chains, and solemnly pledged themselves to die, freemen, rather than be slaves. That detestable act, from which nature recoils in horror, the constitution requires us as a duty. The free states in fact, are compelled to stand sentinels over slavery, and hardly too strong language to say, that it exists now, mainly by force of the protection in the constitution, which secures for its position, the power of the whole nation.

But, sir, these connections politically defined, according to our numbers. Slaveholders, according to their slave-property, 25 represent on the floor of Congress represent slave property. Take one or two facts, as illustrations of the inequitable bearings of the ratio of representation fixed in the Constitution. New Jersey, with a free population of 218,568, has only six representatives in Congress, and four votes for President; and her portion of the free population was \$11,019



of in-  
ed for,  
and con-  
dition  
y number  
postpone  
rea, in or-  
on, that the  
ing all ac-  
tions and  
to do as  
satisfy the  
not legis-  
the will of  
ons. The  
could not  
st. Must  
in place!  
calculated  
the litera-  
re, or sin-  
to nothing  
legislative  
ion of sen-  
of the act  
ered incen-  
for the most  
erate.  
ng for the  
believed as-  
sly. But he  
opinion by  
the slaves—  
l a declara-  
at coercion,  
we wish-  
at right, we  
ere could be  
l upon this  
for the na-  
rehabilitate.  
ing. Great  
very many  
narratives, as  
estimated men-  
the Sabbath,  
as awaken-  
Still there  
use these  
of pas-  
unbeliev-  
We have  
the peni-  
sopors were  
of (Mr. Leach  
remarks  
the substitute,  
cated the re-  
favor of the  
y, McLane,  
McLane and  
others oppos-  
he was lost,  
of the house,  
he exercises,  
using up to  
of slavery  
mind—ep-  
for the im-  
ist the sub-  
of this As-  
sembly  
but a little,  
ried, for the  
t. All sides  
an, expected  
understand-  
is  
been pecu-  
to be laid  
on a subordi-  
as substitute,  
and minister  
the instruc-  
ees, Dr. Hill  
on, mo-  
the subject  
was raising.  
The  
Sabbath and  
Sabbath next  
the body of the  
ceremonies. Dr.  
during the  
communion  
on on Thors-  
the result of the  
States, which  
y 1839, the  
re ce to the an-  
Secretary, with  
be incorpo-  
Americans Anti-  
see that this  
Address ci-  
city.  
Cor. Sec.,  
A. S. Society,  
y.  
nities,) has ta-  
Baker Street,  
he is pre-  
ry reasonable  
recommend-  
EERS.  
t, who shall  
the first day of  
from our list,  
ho are indebi-  
rangement for  
scription will  
BY THE CAV.  
ree of charge  
of him to send  
of the Port-  
in this subject,  
to be better to  
on of a third  
y himself.  
cheerfully do  
payment be-  
ind, and  
dual.  
11, 1840,  
3 00  
50  
21  
25  
16 a 38

